



## County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012  
(213) 974-1101  
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA  
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors  
GLORIA MOLINA  
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS  
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY  
Third District

DON KNABE  
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH  
Fifth District

April 10, 2009

To: Supervisor Don Knabe, Chairman  
Supervisor Gloria Molina  
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas  
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky  
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka  
Chief Executive Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "W. T. Fujioka", written over a horizontal line.

### **SACRAMENTO UPDATE**

This memorandum contains: 1) a summary of the recent White House Regional Forum on Health Care; 2) the pursuit of County positions on five bills which would authorize the issue of water bonds, legislation related to the safe surrender of minor children, and three provisions in the Senate Local Government Committee omnibus bill, one of which is County-sponsored, and is related to the Alhambra Unified School District; and 3) the status of County-interest legislation relating to a renewable energy program, and the fee assessed for legal representation by appointed counsel.

### **Health Care Forum Held in Los Angeles**

The fifth and last in a series of White House Regional Forums on Health Care was held in Los Angeles on April 6, 2009, as part of President Obama's effort to pursue health care reform. Governor Schwarzenegger and Washington Governor Chris Gregoire joined White House Domestic Policy Council Director Melody Barnes in a discussion on how to repair the nation's broken health care system. A number of stakeholders, including consumers, businesses, labor, and patients participated in the event. Supervisors Don Knabe, Mark Ridley-Thomas, and Zev Yaroslavsky were acknowledged at the forum.

*"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"*

**Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided  
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only**

Governor Schwarzenegger thanked President Obama for putting health care reform in the national spotlight, and talked about his attempt to achieve health care reform in 2007. The Governor emphasized that one of the focal points in a new health care delivery system must be prevention.

Governor Gregoire indicated that health care reform is crucial because many Americans are one accident or illness away from personal bankruptcy, even if they have health insurance. She noted that quality health care, including mental health and cost control measures, must be part of national health care reform.

Director Barnes indicated that bringing quality, affordable health care to Americans is one of President Obama's top priorities. She urged Americans to get involved in their local communities and work with their legislators to provide their suggestions for health care reform, noting that to accomplish this goal before the end of the year it was necessary to provide a blueprint for health care reform to the President within the next hundred days.

#### **Pursuit of County Positions on State Water Bond Legislation**

Currently, five major water bond proposals have been introduced in the Legislature that authorize varying amounts of bond funding for water supply reliability, Delta sustainability, surface storage, conservation and watershed protection, and groundwater protection and water quality. All five bills would allow the County to compete for funding for water supply reliability, watershed protection, groundwater protection, and the use of recycled water. The bills are as follows:

- **AB 1187 (Huffman and Caballero)**, as introduced on February 27, 2009, would enact the Safe, Clean, Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2010, which would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$10.035 billion, subject to voter approval, to finance specified water supply reliability and water source protection programs, and require the establishment and imposition of a fee on water users;
- **SB 301 (Flores)**, as introduced on February 25, 2009, would enact the Water Supply Reliability and Ecosystem Recovery Restoration Act of 2009, which would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$15 billion, subject to voter approval, to finance specified water supply reliability and ecosystem recovery and restoration programs;

- **SB 371 (Cogdill)**, as introduced on February 25, 2009, would enact the Safe, Clean, Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2009, which would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$9.98 billion, subject to voter approval, to finance specified water reliability and water source protection programs;
- **SB 456 (Wolk)**, as introduced on February 26, 2009, would enact the Safe, Clean, Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2010, which would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$9.805 billion, subject to voter approval, to finance specified water supply reliability and water source protection programs; and
- **SB 735 (Steinberg)**, as introduced on February 27, 2009, would enact the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2010, which would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$9.785 billion, subject to voter approval, to finance a water supply reliability and water source protection program and authorize the Department of Water Resources to impose fees on water users.

The proposals are very similar with respect to the major funding categories. The Department of Public Works (DPW) is eligible to compete for funding in four of the seven funding categories in the bills. The following table specifies the amount of competitive funding available in the eligible categories:

**POTENTIAL FUNDING ALLOCATIONS FROM WATER BOND LEGISLATION  
FOR WHICH LOS ANGELES COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAN COMPETE**

	<b>Water Supply and Reliability</b>	<b>Conservation and Watershed Protection</b>	<b>Groundwater Protection and Water Quality</b>	<b>Water Recycling and Advanced Treatment Technologies</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>AB 1187</b>	\$ 1.085 billion	\$500 million	\$560 million	\$500 million	\$2.645 billion
<b>SB 301</b>	\$ 1.166 billion	\$500 million	\$500 million	\$200 million	\$2.860 billion
<b>SB 371</b>	\$ 1.160 billion	\$500 million	\$560 million	\$500 million	\$2.720 billion
<b>SB 456</b>	\$ 1.085 billion	\$500 million	\$560 million	\$500 million	\$2.645 billion
<b>SB 735</b>	\$ 1.085 billion	\$500 million	\$560 million	\$500 million	\$2.645 billion

The Department of Public Works is not eligible to compete for funding from the following categories: Delta Sustainability and Conveyance; Statewide Water System Operational

Improvement; and State of California Water Use Efficiency Program. There is no equivalent State of California Water Use Efficiency Program funding category in SB 301, AB 1187, or SB 735. However, AB 1187 and SB 735 impose fees on water users. The former imposes fees to pay for principal and interest on bonds and the latter on residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural water users. The Department of Public Works indicates that the water fees imposed by AB 1187 and SB 735 would increase the department's utility bills although the amount is unknown. A side-by-side comparison of the bills prepared by DPW is contained in an attachment.

The Department of Public Works and this office are supportive of all five bills in general because the County would benefit from increased water supply reliability, watershed protection, groundwater protection, and the use of recycled water. The Department of Public Works indicates that six proposed amendments would make more funds available for project implementation and construction, which will enhance local water supplies to meet existing and future demand, and increase the overall amount of funding available to the Los Angeles County region. The amendments would affect the following provisions in the bill:

#### Administrative Costs and Reporting

- 1) Apply a one percent administrative cap and reduce grantee's reporting and monitoring requirements.

Because the bills allow for a range of one to five percent of the funds for administrative costs, and up to five to ten percent for planning and monitoring costs, capping the administrative costs at one percent, and reducing the reporting and monitoring requirements would allow more funding for actual project implementation and construction.

#### Integrated Regional Water Management Funding

- 2) Increase funding for water supply reliability for the Los Angeles subregion and the North/South Lahontan regions from \$210 million to \$420 million, and from \$75 million to \$150 million, respectively.
- 3) Allocate Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) funding on a per capita basis in lieu of specific allocations.

According to DPW, the proposed amounts are too small to make a meaningful difference in project funding. For example, DPW indicates that the Antelope Valley IRWM region stakeholders identified 18 urgent, high priority projects with a budget of \$657 million to enhance water supply reliability, watershed protection, groundwater protections, and the use of recycled water.

Therefore, the \$75 million allocation for the entire North/South Lahontan region, which encompasses several IRWM regions including the Antelope Valley IRWM, is insufficient and should be increased to \$150 million at a minimum. Ultimately, DPW prefers the allocation of IRWM funding on a per capita basis because it would provide approximately \$500 million for IRWM projects in the Los Angeles subregion, which is a \$290 million increase over the amount provided in each of the bills.

#### Watershed Protection

- 4) Identify in the listing of specified watersheds under Conservation and Watershed Protection, funding for all watersheds in Los Angeles County, which would include the Los Angeles River, San Gabriel River, Antelope Valley, Santa Clara River, Dominguez Channel, and Santa Monica Bay.

There is \$1 billion allocated for watershed projects in each of the bills and the County could benefit by specifically having all of its watersheds identified in the legislation.

#### Groundwater Protection and Water Quality

- 5) Increase funding for groundwater projects to \$500 million and allocate \$100 million for arsenic removal in groundwater.

The Department of Public Works indicates that the funding for groundwater contamination in the bills includes allocations for specific projects and disadvantaged communities, leaving less competitive funding in this category. Furthermore, \$100 million should be allocated specifically for arsenic removal in groundwater because there are planned arsenic treatment projects with anticipated costs of \$10 to \$15 million for groundwater wells in the Antelope Valley that show high levels of arsenic.

#### Water Recycling and Advanced Treatment Projects

- 6) Include \$500 million for water recycling and advanced treatment projects in SB 301 and allocate \$50 million for the Antelope Valley Recycled Water Project in each bill.

SB 301 allocates \$200 million for water recycling and advanced treatment projects while the other bills include \$500 million for this category. In addition, DPW advises that the Antelope Valley Recycled Water Project, which provides a recycled water distribution system, would cost more than \$100 million.

Therefore, the requested \$50 million allocation would provide funding necessary to complete the fundamental framework of this project.

Overall, all five bills are consistent with existing County policy to support the passage of water supply legislation to increase the reliability of State and local water supplies with appropriate infrastructure and equitable funding levels; and to pursue a hybrid solution for the issue of water conservation, addressing both water storage and its quality and conservation. In addition, support for these bills is consistent with the County's adopted water supply policies and principles, and various policies within the adopted State Legislative Agenda, including support for legislation to improve the reliability of water imported into Los Angeles County; encourage water conservation; and increase the efficiency of water use and the use of recycled water within Los Angeles County.

Therefore, consistent with existing County policy, **the Sacramento advocates will support AB 1187, SB 301, SB 371, SB 456, and SB 735, and request that they be amended as indicated above.**

There is no registered support or opposition on file for these bills. AB 1187 is currently in the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee awaiting a hearing date, and SB 301, SB 371, SB 456, and SB 735 are in the Senate Natural Resources Committee awaiting a hearing date.

### **Pursuit of County Position on Legislation**

**AB 1048 (Torrico)**, as amended on March 31, 2009, would: 1) raise the age at which a minor child can be surrendered from 72 hours or younger, to 30 days; 2) allow a local fire agency to designate safe surrender sites with the approval of the local governing body of the agency; 3) specify that persons at a safe surrender site have no liability prior to taking physical custody of a child; 4) require the California Department of Social Services to convene a workgroup to develop and disseminate regulations to clarify rules with respect to a mother who gives up her baby in a hospital, the definition of a safely surrendered baby, and parental information provided to, and received by counties; and 5) fund activities required by AB 1048 using State Children's Trust Fund and California Children and Families Proposition 10 Commission Funds.

AB 1048 is nearly identical to County-opposed AB 2262 (Torrico) of 2008, which would have increased the safe surrender period to seven days, AB 81 (Torrico) of 2007, which would have extended the safe surrender period to 21 days, and AB 1873 (Torrico) of 2006, which would have changed the safe surrender period to 30 days. All of these measures were vetoed by the Governor. In his September 30, 2008 veto message on AB 2262, the Governor stated, "I have vetoed similar measures twice before and there is no new data or information to support a change in my position. California's Safe Surrender Law is carefully crafted to provide an emergency alternative to a woman in

crisis while also preserving the fundamental rights of a child. For this reason, I am unable to support this bill.”

The Department of Children and Family Services and this office oppose AB 1048 because extending the timeframe for surrender of a child from 72 hours to 30 days would place newborns at greater risk by keeping them in an unsafe environment without proper care and supervision for a substantially longer period. Consistent with the County’s opposition to AB 2262, AB 81, AB 1873, and existing policy to oppose proposals that would increase the time allowed to safely surrender an infant from 72 hours to 30 days and to continue to allow local boards of supervisors to designate safe surrender sites, **the Sacramento advocates will oppose AB 1048.**

There is no registered support or opposition on file for AB 1048. However, AB 1048 is most similar to AB 1873 of 2006. That measure was supported by the California State PTA; League of California Cities; California District Attorneys’ Association; California Hospital Association; American College of Emergency Physicians State Chapter of California; National Association of Social Workers; California Chapter; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; California Catholic Conference; California Commission on the Status of Women; California Fire Chiefs Association; City of Ontario; City of Vista; and California State Firefighters Association. AB 1873 was opposed by the County Welfare Directors Association, California State Association of Counties; and Los Angeles County District Attorney.

AB 1048 is scheduled for a hearing in the Assembly Public Safety Committee on April 14, 2009.

**SB 113 (Senate Local Government Committee)**, as amended on April 2, 2009, is an omnibus bill that would make a number of minor, non-controversial changes to laws affecting the powers and duties of local agencies which have been proposed by local officials. Each item in the omnibus bill is extensively vetted and, if there is an objection, the item is removed from the legislation.

SB 113 contains one County-sponsored item, the Alhambra Unified School District – School Facilities Improvement District, as reported in the March 27, 2009 Sacramento Update, which would authorize a county board of supervisors to form a School Facilities Improvement District in an individual school district. In addition, as reported in the March 31, 2009 Sacramento Update, the County is seeking inclusion of the following two County-supported provisions in SB 113: 1) minor revisions to the Public Contract Code to align the requirements for County Waterworks Districts to contract for non-construction related work with the contracting requirements for County government to perform similar work; and 2) minor revisions to the Water Code which would allow County Waterworks Districts to advance water reliability projects and water

Each Supervisor  
April 10, 2009  
Page 8

system facility construction. The Sacramento advocates indicate that these items are likely to be included in the legislation. The rest of the provisions contained in SB 113 do not affect the County. Because SB 113 already contains a County-sponsored proposal, and potentially include the two County Waterworks Districts provisions in the bill, **the Sacramento advocates will support SB 113.**

SB 113 is sponsored by the Senate Local Government Committee and supported by State Controller John Chiang; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees AFL-CIO; California Association of County Treasurers and Tax Collectors; California Association of LAFCOs; California Special Districts Association; Butte County Air Quality Management District; Contra Costa County Water Agency; Napa and Sonoma counties; and Sempra Energy. There is no opposition. SB 113 is scheduled for a hearing on April 15, 2009 in the Senate Local Government Committee.

#### **Status of County-Interest Legislation**

**SB 676 (Wolk)**, as introduced on February 27, 2009, would increase the registration fee assessed on each defendant represented by appointed counsel from \$25 to \$50. It would continue existing provisions to waive fees for those defendants financially unable to pay the fee. The fee increase would be operative upon adoption of a resolution or ordinance by a board of supervisors.

According to the California Public Defenders Association, this fee has not been increased since it was initially established in 1996. The increased revenue that would be generated by this fee increase has not been determined, but it is not expected to be significant.

SB 676 is sponsored by Yolo County and supported by the California Public Defenders Association. There is no known opposition. SB 676 is awaiting a hearing date in the Senate Public Safety Committee.

We will continue to keep you advised.

WTF:GK  
MAL:MR:MS:sb

Attachment

c: All Department Heads  
Legislative Strategist



# Summary of 2009 Water Bond Bills (SB 371, SB 301, AB 1187, SB 456, and SB 735)

SB 371 (\$9.98B)	SB 301 (\$15B)	AB 1187 (\$10.035 B)	SB 456 (\$9.805 B)	SB 735 (\$9.785 B)
5% admin cost cap, 10% planning/monitoring cap	1% admin cost cap, 5% planning/monitoring cap	5% admin cost cap, 10% planning/monitoring cap	5% admin cost cap, 10% planning/monitoring cap	5% admin cost cap, 10% planning/monitoring cap
<b>Ch. 6 Water Supply Reliability (\$2.125B)</b>	<b>Ch. 6 Water Supply Reliability (\$2.5B)</b>	<b>Ch. 6 Water Supply Reliability (\$2.0 B)</b>	<b>Ch. 6 Water Supply Reliability (\$2.0 B)</b>	<b>Ch. 6 Water Supply Reliability (\$2.0 B)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.5B for Integrated Regional Water Mgmt (IRWM) project implementation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (25% local cost share)</li> <li>o \$210M LA &amp; Ventura Counties</li> <li>o \$75M north/south Lahontan (Antelope Valley)</li> <li>o \$300M interregional projects                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ \$50M for recreation at state water projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ \$1B for local and regional conveyance projects                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (50% local cost share)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ \$125M for drought relief projects                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (50% local cost share)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.5B for IRWM project implementation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (50% local cost share)</li> <li>o \$210M LA &amp; Ventura Counties</li> <li>o \$75M north/south Lahontan (Antelope Valley)</li> <li>o \$300M interregional projects                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ \$50M for recreation at state water projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ \$1B for local and regional conveyance projects                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (50% local cost share)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ \$125M for drought relief projects                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (50% local cost share)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.5B for IRWM project implementation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (50% local cost share)</li> <li>o \$210M LA &amp; Ventura Counties</li> <li>o \$75M north/south Lahontan (Antelope Valley)</li> <li>o \$300M interregional projects                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ \$500M for drought relief projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>o (50% local cost share)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.5B for IRWM project implementation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (50% local cost share)</li> <li>o \$210M LA &amp; Ventura Counties</li> <li>o \$75M north/south Lahontan (Antelope Valley)</li> <li>o \$300M interregional projects                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ \$500M for drought relief projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>o (50% local cost share)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.5B for IRWM project implementation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (50% local cost share)</li> <li>o \$210M LA &amp; Ventura Counties</li> <li>o \$75M north/south Lahontan (Antelope Valley)</li> <li>o \$300M interregional projects                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ \$500M for drought relief projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>o (50% local cost share)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>DPW can compete for \$1.16B (\$210M+\$75M+\$250M*+\$500M+\$125M)</b>	<b>DPW can compete for \$1.66B (\$210M+\$75M+\$250M*+\$1B+\$125M)</b>	<b>DPW can compete for \$1.085B (\$210M+\$75M+\$300M+\$500M)</b>	<b>DPW can compete for \$1.085B (\$210M+\$75M+\$300M+\$500M)</b>	<b>DPW can compete for \$1.085B (\$210M+\$75M+\$300M+\$500M)</b>
*The \$250M came from the funds for interregional projects. \$50M out of the \$300M for interregional projects is already allocated for recreation for state water projects, so DPW can compete for as much as \$250M.	*The \$250M came from the funds for interregional projects. \$50M out of the \$300M for interregional projects is already allocated for recreation for state water projects, so DPW can compete for as much as \$250M.			
<b>Ch. 7 Delta Sustainability (\$1.9B)</b>	<b>Ch. 7 Delta Sustainability and Conveyance (\$2.0B)</b>	<b>Ch. 7 Delta Sustainability (\$1.9 B)</b>	<b>Ch. 7 Delta Sustainability (\$1.9 B)</b>	<b>Ch. 7 Delta Sustainability (\$1.9 B)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$700M for Delta levees, water quality, habitat, transportation</li> <li>\$1.2B for Delta ecosystem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$700M for Delta levees, water quality, habitat, transportation</li> <li>\$1.3B for Delta ecosystem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$700M for Delta levees, water quality, habitat, Delta sustainability projects</li> <li>\$1.2B for Delta ecosystem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.2B for Delta sustainability projects</li> <li>\$700M for Delta ecosystem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$700M for Delta sustainability projects</li> <li>\$1.2B for Delta ecosystem</li> </ul>
<b>DPW can compete for \$0</b>	<b>DPW can compete for \$0</b>	<b>DPW can compete for \$0</b>	<b>DPW can compete for \$0</b>	<b>DPW can compete for \$0</b>

# Summary of 2009 Water Bond Bills (SB 371, SB 301, AB 1187, SB 456, and SB 735)

Ch. 8 Statewide Water System Operational Improvement (\$3B)	Ch. 8 Statewide Water System Operational Improvement (\$7B)	Ch. 8 Statewide Water System Operational Improvement (\$3B)	Ch. 8 Statewide Water System Operational Improvement (\$3B)	Ch. 8 Statewide Water System Operational Improvement (\$3B)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$3B for surface storage, groundwater storage, conjunctive use &amp; reservoir reoperation</li> <li>State's share not more than 50%</li> <li>75% of nonpublic sharing must be identified by 1/1/14</li> <li>Per Sec 79741.5, projects must benefit Delta ecosystem</li> <li>No assurances of water deliveries from Delta</li> </ul> <p><b>DPW can compete for \$0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$7 billion for surface storage, groundwater storage, conjunctive use &amp; reservoir reoperation</li> <li>Per Sec 79741, projects must benefit Delta ecosystem</li> <li>No assurances of water deliveries from Delta</li> </ul> <p><b>DPW can compete for \$0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$3 billion for surface storage, groundwater storage, conjunctive use &amp; reservoir reoperation</li> <li>Per Sec 79741.5, projects must benefit Delta ecosystem</li> <li>No assurances of water deliveries from Delta</li> </ul> <p><b>DPW can compete for \$0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$3 billion for surface storage, groundwater storage, conjunctive use &amp; reservoir reoperation</li> <li>Per Sec 79741.5, projects must benefit Delta ecosystem</li> <li>No assurances of water deliveries from Delta</li> </ul> <p><b>DPW can compete for \$0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$3 billion for surface storage, groundwater storage, conjunctive use &amp; reservoir reoperation</li> <li>Per Sec 79741.5, projects must benefit Delta ecosystem</li> <li>No assurances of water deliveries from Delta</li> </ul> <p><b>DPW can compete for \$0</b></p>
Chapter 9. Conservation and Watershed Protection (\$1.385B)	Chapter 9. Ecosystem Recovery and Restoration (\$2.5 B)	Chapter 9. Conservation and Watershed Protection (\$1.585 B)	Chapter 9. Conservation and Watershed Protection (\$1.335 B)	Chapter 9. Conservation and Watershed Protection (\$1.335 B)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1B for watershed projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LA River/San Gabriel River/Santa Monica Bay</li> <li>South coast watersheds</li> <li>\$500M earmarked (DPW not eligible)</li> <li>Antelope Valley, Santa Clara River, &amp; Dominguez Channel watersheds not listed</li> <li>LA River Revitalization Master Plan named as recipient</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$85M for invasive species in the Delta</li> <li>\$100M for fire damaged areas</li> <li>\$150M fish passage</li> <li>\$50M salmonid passage</li> <li>No cost share minimum specified.</li> </ul> <p><b>DPW can compete for \$500M for watershed</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1B for watershed projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LA River/San Gabriel River</li> <li>South coast watersheds</li> <li>\$500M earmarked (DPW not eligible)</li> <li>Santa Monica Bay, Antelope Valley, Santa Clara River, &amp; Dominguez Channel watersheds not listed</li> <li>LA River Revitalization Master Plan named as recipient</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$1B Delta projects</li> <li>\$250M for invasive species in the Delta</li> <li>\$100M for fire damaged areas</li> <li>\$150M for fish passage</li> <li>No cost share minimum specified.</li> </ul> <p><b>DPW can compete for \$500M for watershed</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1B for watershed projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LA River/San Gabriel River/Santa Monica Bay</li> <li>South coast watersheds</li> <li>\$500M earmarked (DPW not eligible)</li> <li>Antelope Valley, Santa Clara River, &amp; Dominguez Channel watersheds not listed</li> <li>LA River Revitalization Master Plan named as recipient</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$85M for invasive species in the Delta</li> <li>\$100M for fire damaged areas</li> <li>\$400M for fish populations</li> <li>No cost share minimum specified.</li> </ul> <p><b>DPW can compete for \$500M for watershed</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1B for watershed projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LA River/San Gabriel River/Santa Monica Bay</li> <li>South coast watersheds</li> <li>\$500M earmarked (DPW not eligible)</li> <li>Antelope Valley, Santa Clara River, &amp; Dominguez Channel watersheds not listed</li> <li>LA River Revitalization Master Plan named as recipient</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$85M for invasive species in the Delta</li> <li>\$100M for fire damaged areas</li> <li>\$150M for fish passage</li> <li>No cost share minimum specified.</li> </ul> <p><b>DPW can compete for \$500M for watershed</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1B for watershed projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LA River/San Gabriel River/Santa Monica Bay</li> <li>South coast watersheds</li> <li>\$500M earmarked (DPW not eligible)</li> <li>Antelope Valley, Santa Clara River, &amp; Dominguez Channel watersheds not listed</li> <li>LA River Revitalization Master Plan named as recipient</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$85M for invasive species in the Delta</li> <li>\$100M for fire damaged areas</li> <li>\$150M for fish passage</li> <li>No cost share minimum specified.</li> </ul> <p><b>DPW can compete for \$500M for watershed</b></p>

# Summary of 2009 Water Bond Bills (SB 371, SB 301, AB 1187, SB 456, and SB 735)

Chapter 10. Groundwater Protection and Water Quality (\$1.05 B)	Chapter 10. Groundwater Protection and Water Quality (\$0.8 B)	Chapter 10. Groundwater Protection and Water Quality (\$1.05 B)	Chapter 10. Groundwater Protection and Water Quality (\$1.05 B)	Chapter 10. Groundwater Protection and Water Quality (\$1.05 B)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$360M for projects to prevent or reduce groundwater contamination                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No cost share specific</li> <li>\$100M disadvantaged communities (DACs)</li> <li>\$100M specific projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$90M for expends to finance emergency or urgent actions on behalf of DACs</li> <li>\$200M for small community wastewater treatment projects</li> <li>\$300M for stormwater projects                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% cost share</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$100M for Ocean Protection Trust Fund</li> </ul> <p>DPW can compete for \$560M (\$160M** for groundwater +\$300M for stormwater+\$100M for Ocean Protection)</p> <p>**The \$160M comes from the \$360M funds to prevent or reduce groundwater contamination. \$200M out of the \$360M funding for groundwater projects is already earmarked for DACs and specific projects, so DPW can compete for as much as \$160M.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$300M for projects to prevent or reduce groundwater contamination                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No cost share specific</li> <li>\$100M DACs</li> <li>\$100M specific projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$100M for small community wastewater treatment projects</li> <li>\$300M for stormwater projects                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% cost share</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$100M for Ocean Protection Trust Fund</li> <li>Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) specifically named</li> </ul> <p>DPW can compete for \$500M (\$100M*** for groundwater +\$300M for stormwater+\$100M for Ocean Protection)</p> <p>***The \$100M comes from the \$300M funds to prevent or reduce groundwater contamination. \$200M out of the \$300M funding for groundwater projects is already earmarked for DACs and specific projects, so DPW can compete for as much as \$100M.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$360M for projects to prevent or reduce groundwater contamination                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No cost share specific</li> <li>\$100M DACs</li> <li>\$100M specific projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$90M for expends to finance emergency or urgent actions on behalf of DACs</li> <li>\$200M for small community wastewater treatment projects</li> <li>\$300M for stormwater projects                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% cost share</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$100M for Ocean Protection Trust Fund</li> </ul> <p>DPW can compete for \$560M (\$160M** for groundwater +\$300M for stormwater+\$100M for Ocean Protection)</p> <p>**The \$160M comes from the \$360M funds to prevent or reduce groundwater contamination. \$200M out of the \$360M funding for groundwater projects is already earmarked for DACs and specific projects, so DPW can compete for as much as \$160M.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$360M for projects to prevent or reduce groundwater contamination                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No cost share specific</li> <li>\$100M DACs</li> <li>\$100M specific projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$90M for expends to finance emergency or urgent actions on behalf of DACs</li> <li>\$200M for small community wastewater treatment projects</li> <li>\$300M for stormwater projects                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% cost share</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$100M for Ocean Protection Trust Fund</li> </ul> <p>DPW can compete for \$560M (\$160M** for groundwater +\$300M for stormwater+\$100M for Ocean Protection)</p> <p>**The \$160M comes from the \$360M funds to prevent or reduce groundwater contamination. \$200M out of the \$360M funding for groundwater projects is already earmarked for DACs and specific projects, so DPW can compete for as much as \$160M.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$360M for projects to prevent or reduce groundwater contamination                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No cost share specific</li> <li>\$100M DACs</li> <li>\$100M specific projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$90M for expends to finance emergency or urgent actions on behalf of DACs</li> <li>\$200M for small community wastewater treatment projects</li> <li>\$300M for stormwater projects                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% cost share</li> </ul> </li> <li>\$100M for Ocean Protection Trust Fund</li> </ul> <p>DPW can compete for \$560M (\$160M** for groundwater +\$300M for stormwater+\$100M for Ocean Protection)</p> <p>**The \$160M comes from the \$360M funds to prevent or reduce groundwater contamination. \$200M out of the \$360M funding for groundwater projects is already earmarked for DACs and specific projects, so DPW can compete for as much as \$160M.</p>

# Summary of 2009 Water Bond Bills (SB 371, SB 301, AB 1187, SB 456, and SB 735)

Chapter 11. Water Recycling and Advanced Treatment Technologies (\$0.5 B)	Chapter 11. Water Recycling Program (\$0.2 B)	Chapter 11. Water Recycling and Advanced Treatment Technologies (\$0.5 B)	Chapter 11. Water Recycling and Advanced Treatment Technologies (\$0.5 B)	Chapter 11. Water Recycling and Advanced Treatment Technologies (\$0.5 B)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$500M for water recycling &amp; advanced treatment technology projects</li> <li>50% cost share</li> <li>DPW can compete for \$500M for water recycling &amp; treatment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$200M for water recycling &amp; advanced treatment technology projects</li> <li>50% cost share</li> <li>DPW can compete for \$200M for water recycling &amp; treatment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$500M for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects</li> <li>50% cost share</li> <li>DPW can compete for \$500M for water recycling &amp; treatment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$500M for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects</li> <li>50% cost share</li> <li>DPW can compete for \$500M for water recycling &amp; treatment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$500M for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects</li> <li>50% cost share</li> <li>DPW can compete for \$500M for water recycling &amp; treatment</li> </ul>
Chapter 12. State of California Water Use Efficiency Program (\$0.02 B)	No Equivalent Provided	Chapter 12. Statewide Water Fee	Chapter 12. State of California Water Use Efficiency Program (\$0.02 B)	Chapter 12. California Water Resources Fund
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$20M for water efficiency at State buildings, facilities, and grounds.</li> </ul> <p>DPW can compete for \$0</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fee to be imposed on water users to pay for principal and interest on bonds</li> </ul> <p>Cost to DPW via higher utility bills</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$20M for water efficiency at State buildings, facilities, and grounds</li> </ul> <p>DPW can compete for \$0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fee to be imposed on residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural water users</li> </ul> <p>Cost to DPW via higher utility bills</p>
Chapter 13. Fiscal Provisions	Chapter 12. Fiscal Provisions	Chapter 13. Fiscal Provisions	Chapter 13. Fiscal Provisions	Chapter 13. Fiscal Provisions
DPW can compete for \$2.72B Total	DPW can compete for \$2.86B Total	DPW can compete for \$2.645B Total	DPW can compete for \$2.645B Total	DPW can compete for \$2.645B Total

The highlighted areas are where DPW can compete for funding.

## Summary of 2009 Water Bond Bills (SB 371, SB 301, AB 1187, SB 456, and SB 735)

We would support all bills in general because Los Angeles County would benefit from increased water supply reliability, watershed protection, groundwater protection, and the use of recycled water.

We would also recommend the following changes:

General Provisions: Apply 1% administrative cost cap and also reduce grantee's reporting and monitoring requirements in all bills to make more funds available for project implementation/construction.

Chapter 6: In all five bills, increase the funding for the Los Angeles Subregion and the North/South Lahontan regions from \$210M to \$420M and from \$75M to \$150M, respectively. Increased funding is necessary for the planned projects we have which will enhance local water supplies to meet existing and future demand. Funding allocations to IRWM areas should be apportioned based on population.

Chapter 9: All bills should include all the watersheds in Los Angeles County by adding Antelope Valley, Santa Clara River, Dominguez Channel, and Santa Monica Bay in the list of specified watersheds.

Chapter 10: All bills should provide \$500M for groundwater projects and \$100M should be earmarked for arsenic removal in groundwater so that our planned Arsenic Treatment for Wells in the Antelope Valley project which requires \$10-15M will receive sufficient funding.

Chapter 11: All bills should provide \$500M for water recycling and treatment projects and \$50M should be earmarked for the Antelope Valley Recycled Water project.